

BERKSHIRE LOCAL TRANSPORT BODY (BLTB)

REPORT TO: BLTB

DATE: 15 March 2018

CONTACT OFFICER: Nigel Pallace, Interim Chief Executive Slough Borough Council, lead Chief Executive to the BLTB

PART I

Item 8: Mayor of London's Draft Transport Strategy – report back from 2017 Consultation

Purpose of Report

1. Colleagues will recall that in 2017 the Mayor of London launched his [draft Transport Strategy for London](#)¹, and that at your meeting on 20 July 2017 you agreed a [response to the consultation](#)².
2. The Mayor has now published TfL's [response](#)³ to the consultation, and this report sets out how our views have shaped the final Transport Strategy.

Recommendation

3. You are asked to note the report.

Other Implications

Financial

4. There are no direct financial implications of this report for Berkshire Local Transport Body.

Risk Management

5. There are limited risks for Berkshire Local Transport Body associated with the Mayor of London's Transport Strategy.

Human Rights Act and Other Legal Implications

6. Slough Borough Council will provide legal support for the BLTB, should any questions arise.

Supporting Information

7. The document "[TfL's Report to the Mayor on the statutory consultation March 2018](#)" runs to 208 pages and covers all aspects of the consultation response.

¹ <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/how-we-work/planning-for-the-future/the-mayors-transport-strategy>

² <http://www.slough.gov.uk/moderngov/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=601&MIId=5719&Ver=4> see item 7.

³ https://consultations.tfl.gov.uk/policy/mayors-transport-strategy/user_uploads/mts-consultation-report-4.pdf

8. The report says, “We received 6,110 public responses and 476 responses from stakeholders and businesses which generated 43,550 discrete comments. We received a further 383 campaign-based responses as part of five stakeholder led campaigns. We also ran a series of deliberative workshops to ensure we received the views of a diverse sample of Londoners.”
9. An edited version of the TVB LEP response is reproduced at Appendix 1. I have omitted the questions where we made no comment. I have added a summary of the TfL report’s commentary on the consultation responses where we did make submissions.
10. The most significant section of the report for TVB LEP is section on Public transport links to airports / Focus on the unacceptable impact of expanding Heathrow (pp180-2), reproduced here:

6.5.11 Public transport links to airports / Focus on the unacceptable impact of expanding Heathrow (Policy 20 and proposals 95-96)

Comments in support: We received 79 supportive comments from stakeholders and businesses and 41 supportive comments from the public. Particular areas of support were at times conflicting and included:

- Improving surface links to London airports
- Seeking commitment from Government to fund and deliver transport measures supporting Heathrow expansion
- Another runway or alternative airport in the south-east (e.g. Gatwick or Stansted)
- The strategy’s position on Heathrow expansion

Comments noting concerns or opposition: We received 101 comments of concern from stakeholders and businesses and 57 comments of concern from the public. Particular areas of concern were:

Heathrow expansion

- Heathrow cannot be expanded with zero increases in air and noise pollution and traffic congestion
- Oppose the strategy’s position on Heathrow expansion – suggest the Mayor supports the findings of the independent Airports Commission
- The aspiration for no net increase in passenger and staff highway trips as a result of Heathrow expansion is unachievable
- Concern over funding for transport schemes linked to Heathrow expansion, e.g. proposed Southern Rail Access Improving rail access to Heathrow without airport expansion
- Proposed Southern rail link to Heathrow airport is needed with or without expansion - Some respondents expressed concern about the alignment for this scheme as shown in Figure 52

Comments making suggestions: We received 175 comments of suggestion from stakeholders and businesses and 122 comments of suggestion from the public. Particular suggestions included:

Heathrow expansion

- Opposition of Heathrow expansion should be unconditional
- Heathrow and/or Gatwick must be expanded as a priority to support the economy
- Heathrow expansion should be conditional on mitigation or air and noise pollution for all affected Londoners both now and in the future

- Heathrow expansion should only occur if improvements to public transport links will accommodate background growth as well as demand

Rail links to airports

- Proposal should reference additional schemes, including Heathrow Southern Access, Heathrow Western Access and Brighton Main Line
- Rail links to all airports should be improved Improving rail access to Heathrow without airport expansion
- Surface access improvement to Heathrow is required regardless of its potential expansion

TfL response and recommendation

Heathrow expansion

The Mayor's position on expansion is clear in its opposition to Heathrow expansion, underpinned by the evidence presented the Airports Commission and the Government's National Policy Statement (NPS), as well as analysis undertaken by TfL. In his submissions to Government, the Mayor is adamant that expansion cannot be taken forward as proposed, with severe noise and air quality impacts and without the transport investment that could accommodate the additional traffic from expansion alongside background demand.

The aspiration for no increase in highway trips is Heathrow Airport's, and is recognised by the Mayor as critical.

The Mayor seeks better use of existing capacity but also recognises the pressing need for new capacity so long as it can be delivered without severe environmental impacts or placing significant pressure on surface access networks. His aviation policy is further elaborated in the Draft London Plan.

TfL recommends a change to the narrative to clarify that the aspiration for no increase in highway trips is Heathrow Airport's, not Government's.

Improving rail access to Heathrow without airport expansion

The Mayor believes investment in significant new public transport infrastructure is essential for Heathrow expansion and he remains deeply concerned that none is currently committed.

Since the draft MTS was published, a process has been launched with the key stakeholders to better understand the nature of the surface access requirement and assess the various options. Once the package of surface access schemes required to enable expansion is identified, it will be the responsibility of Heathrow Airport and the Government to set out how they will be funded, including a key role for the former. The Mayor has been explicit in his submissions to Government that it should not be left to Londoners to pay for the transport improvements required.

Government policy is to support Heathrow expansion and schemes which have not yet been committed such as Western Rail Access and Southern Rail Access should be developed on that basis. Should the Government reverse its policy support for a third runway, then the schemes can be reviewed on that basis, recognising that the objectives, design, business case and funding approach of any scheme could be considerably different under a non-expansion scenario.

TfL recommends a change to Proposal 96 to add a clause stating that the Mayor will engage with stakeholders to assess the various options for surface access to Heathrow.

So as not to prejudge the conclusion of that process, TfL recommends a change to remove the map showing the indicative alignment of the Southern Rail Access scheme and a change to the narrative to clarify, at a high level, what is required of any Heathrow surface access scheme.

Rail links to airports

The importance of good rail links to all of London's airports is emphasised in the strategy. The strategy states that improvements should include:

- New, longer trains for Gatwick and Luton airports as part of the Thameslink Programme and Brighton Main Line upgrade, followed by next phase of upgrade and redevelopment of Gatwick Airport station.*
- Upgrading the West Anglia Main Line serving Stansted airport, including four-tracking, to be followed by increasing frequencies associated with Crossrail 2.*
- Enabling new routes and frequencies to Heathrow airport, with the delivery of the Elizabeth line.*
- Further introduction of full-length and more frequent DLR services to London City airport.*
- Increased frequencies on rail services to Southend airport.*
- New automated people-mover to better connect Luton airport with the rail network.*

TfL recommends a change to the narrative to add a reference to the next phase of the Brighton Main Line upgrade and the redevelopment of Gatwick Airport station.

Conclusion

11. The Mayor of London has conducted a full consultation on the proposed Transport Strategy, and some of our comments have been acknowledged and incorporated into the recommended final version.

Background Papers

12. The relevant documents are all referenced in the text of the report

Appendix

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
CHAPTER 1 – THE CHALLENGE (pp 9-16)	<p>1) London faces a number of growing challenges to the sustainability of its transport system. To re-examine the way people move about the city in the context of these challenges, it is important that they have been correctly identified.</p> <p>– Please provide your views on the challenges outlined in the strategy, and describe any others you think should be considered.</p>	<p>London is a world-class city, and both its influence and economic impact are felt well beyond its electoral boundary. In common with other Local Enterprise Partnerships that border London, Thames Valley Berkshire acknowledges the advantages of being located close to London.</p> <p>We agree that the challenges identified are all relevant; in addition we suggest that the themes that are covered in the section: “LONDON’S LINKS WITH THE WIDER SOUTH EAST AND BEYOND” (pp 178-181) should be brought into the “Challenges” chapter, with particular emphasis on the idea expressed in Proposal 70 “<i>The Mayor, through the GLA and TfL, will work with relevant stakeholders to seek to ensure that transport investment on corridors in the Wider South East supports the realisation of any associated economic and housing growth potential.</i>”</p>	<p>39% Strongly agree 32% Partially agree 13% partially or strongly disagree The remainder neither agree nor disagree, have no opinion or did not answer.</p> <p>The summary notes the following suggestion <i>“Recognition of challenges facing the areas adjacent to London”</i></p> <p>And responds</p> <p><i>“Funding challenge and cross-borough / boundary delivery</i> <i>Chapter six of the strategy sets out how the strategy will be funded and acknowledges the challenges around this. It is felt that this is a more appropriate section for these challenges to be raised. The MTS makes clear the need for the Mayor, TfL, London’s boroughs and other delivery partners to work closely together to deliver the aims of the strategy. TfL in particular will be working closely with the boroughs to support the delivery of the strategy as well as with London Councils. There is also a commitment in the strategy to work more closely with neighbouring authorities on cross boundary issues. There will be on-going stakeholder engagement following the publication of the final strategy to ensure any future challenges can be overcome. TfL recommends no change to the strategy in response to these comments.</i></p>
CHAPTER 2 – THE VISION	2) The Mayor’s vision is to create a future London that is not only home	We support this statement of the vision	46% Strongly agree 22% Partially agree

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
(pp 17-38)	to more people, but is a better place for all of those people to live and work in. The aim is that, by 2041, 80 per cent of Londoners' trips will be made on foot, by cycle or using public transport. – To what extent do you support or oppose this proposed vision and its central aim?		17% partially or strongly disagree The remainder neither agree nor disagree, have no opinion or did not answer.
CHAPTER 2 – THE VISION (pp 17-38)	3) To support this vision, the strategy proposes to pursue the following further aims:		
	• by 2041, for all Londoners to do at least the 20 minutes of active travel they need to stay healthy each day		47% Strongly agree 19% Partially agree 16% partially or strongly disagree
	• for no one to be killed in, or by, a London bus by 2030, and for deaths and serious injuries from all road collisions to be eliminated from our streets by 2041		63% Strongly agree 12% Partially agree 9% partially or strongly disagree
	• for all buses to be zero emission by 2037, for all new road vehicles driven in London to be zero emission by 2040, and for London's entire transport system to be zero emission by 2050		62% Strongly agree 14% Partially agree 12% partially or strongly disagree
	• by 2041, to reduce traffic volumes by about 6 million vehicle kilometres per day, including reductions in freight traffic at peak times, to help keep streets operating efficiently for essential business and the public		54% Strongly agree 17% Partially agree 13% partially or strongly disagree

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
	• to open Crossrail 2 by 2033		49% Strongly agree 16% Partially agree 8% partially or strongly disagree
	• to create a London suburban metro by the late 2020s, with suburban rail services being devolved to the Mayor		50% Strongly agree 19% Partially agree 11% partially or strongly disagree
	• to improve the overall accessibility of the transport system including, by 2041, halving the average additional time taken to make a public transport journey on the step-free network compared with the full network		57% Strongly agree 19% Partially agree 5% partially or strongly disagree
	• to apply the principles of good growth		49% Strongly agree 19% Partially agree 5% partially or strongly disagree
	– To what extent do you agree or disagree with the aims set out in this chapter?	We support these aims	
CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE (pp 115-190)	16) Policy 14 and proposals 55 to 67 set out the Mayor’s draft plans to improve rail services by improving journey times and tackling crowding (see pages 140 to 166).. – To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this?	We support Policy 14 and the associated proposals.	36% Strongly agree 27% Partially agree 14% partially or strongly disagree
		We suggest that appropriate recognition should be given to the need to develop partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London where rail services also serve areas outside London.	No comment made
		Proposal 56 refers specifically to Crossrail 2, including to “ <i>finalising the route alignment and stations.</i> ”	No comment made

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
		<p>There is an opportunity to revisit the extreme south-western alignment, including giving further consideration to using Crossrail 2 to deliver Southern Rail Access to Heathrow Airport. Figure 52 on page 251 shows a possible alignment for Southern Rail Access to Heathrow running alongside Crossrail 2 at Kingston and again on the South West mainline to the south-west of Wimbledon.</p>	
		<p>Proposal 57 refers to “<i>opening the Elizabeth Line in 2019</i>”. We strongly support this proposal, as this service will provide important local services in Thames Valley Berkshire (serving Reading, Twyford, Maidenhead, Burnham, Slough and Langley in Berkshire as well as Taplow and Iver in Buckinghamshire).</p>	<p>The summary notes comments in support “<i>Delivering Crossrail 2 by 2033</i>” and “<i>Opening the Elizabeth Line in 2019 and increasing its frequency as required</i>”</p>
		<p>We suggest further commitments should be made to exploring the opportunities for coordinating Elizabeth Line services with the proposed Western Rail Link to Heathrow services in order to eliminate turn-back services and promote through running at Heathrow.</p>	<p>No comment made</p>
		<p>We further suggest that consideration be given to allowing outer-suburban services on the</p>	<p>No comment made</p>

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
		<p>Great Western Line (originating in, say Newbury, Didcot or Oxford) access to the Elizabeth Line tunnels, thus allowing more commuting journeys to be completed without the need for interchange at Paddington, Old Oak Common or other intermediate stations.</p>	
		<p>Proposal 59 refers to “<i>encourage the DfT to increase the capacity of the national rail network in London to manage crowding on both local and longer distance services.</i>” We suggest that this be amended to include a reference to undertaking this task in partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London.</p>	<p>The summary includes the following commentary, “<i>National Rail investment concerns and suggestions relating to capacity, reliability, service patterns, journey times and long-term investment on the national rail network in London are noted. TfL recommends a change to Proposal 59 and the narrative to add more detail on national rail priorities and the importance of the national rail network in delivering the aims of the strategy.</i>”</p>
		<p>Proposal 61 refers to “<i>devolution from DfT to the Mayor/TfL of the responsibility for local stopping rail services</i>”. In effect the decision to operate the Elizabeth Line as a TfL concession has already achieved this proposal for a large number of local stopping services on the Great West Mainline. The logic of the service means that the concession includes services outside London. We suggest that it is important to develop further proposals for devolution in</p>	<p>The summary includes the following commentary, “<i>Rail devolution A minority of respondents expressed opposition or concern relating to rail devolution. This is noted. TfL has proven what can be delivered from rail devolution – more frequent trains, fewer cancellations and delays, more staff on stations and more affordable fares. There is a very strong business case for devolving local stopping services to TfL: http://content.tfl.gov.uk/rail-devolution-business-case-narrative.pdf. The MTS already states that passengers using longer-distance services would be unaffected in terms of fares, train stopping patterns or relative priority of services. TfL</i></p>

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
		partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London.	<i>recommends no change to the strategy in response to these comments.</i>
		Proposal 64 refers to the upgrade of “rail freight routes outside London”. We suggest that this be amended to include a reference to undertaking this task in partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London.	The summary recommends “a change to move Proposal 64 to this new focus box, and a change to clarify the importance of working with Network Rail and make clear that both passenger services and London-bound freight services would be beneficiaries when rail paths within London are freed following upgrades to rail freight routes outside London.”
CHAPTER 4 – A GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT EXPERIENCE (pp 115-190)	17) Policies 15 to 18 and proposals 68 to 74 set out the Mayor’s draft plans to ensure river services, regional and national rail connections, coaches, and taxi and private hire contribute to the delivery of a fully inclusive and well-connected public transport system. The Mayor’s policy to support the growing night-time economy is also set out in this section (see pages 176 to 187). – To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would deliver a well-connected public transport system?	Policy 16 says “ <i>The Mayor, through TfL, will support improvements to public transport to enhance travel between London and the rest of the UK, and require regional and national public transport schemes to be integrated into London’s public transport system wherever practical.</i> ” We welcome the Mayor’s support for transport improvements outside London. We suggest that this Policy should be amended to include words reflecting the spirit of “partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London”.	The summary notes the following responses, “ <i>Comments in support</i> <i>We received 34 supportive comments from stakeholders and businesses. Respondents supported the overall policy and gave qualified support for strategic investment on corridors in the Wider South East that support economic and housing growth, provided this growth is mutually beneficial and not solely for to the benefit of London.</i> <i>Comments noting concerns or opposition</i> <i>We received 16 comments of concern from stakeholders and businesses and 8 comments of concern from the public. Respondents expressed concern that the strategy may imply that London’s housing needs would be accommodated by neighbouring authorities.</i> <i>Comments making suggestions</i> <i>We received 43 comments of suggestion from stakeholders and businesses and 13 comments of suggestion from the public. Suggestions were primarily around improving connectivity to neighbouring authorities, including making a</i>

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
			<p><i>stronger commitment to the Metropolitan Line Extension.”</i></p> <p><i>It goes on, “Improving connectivity to neighbouring authorities: Policy 16 states the importance of integrating regional public transport schemes into London’s public transport system wherever practical. TfL recommends a change to Policy 16 to add reference to international travel (e.g. Channel Tunnel) to indicate that this is also within the scope of the policy.”</i></p>
		<p>We welcome Proposal 70 <i>“The Mayor, through the GLA and TfL, will work with relevant stakeholders to seek to ensure that transport investment on corridors in the Wider South East supports the realisation of any associated economic and housing growth potential.”</i> In particular we welcome the commitment to working with relevant stakeholders, and we acknowledge that dialogue already established in the Wider South East Group.</p> <p>We suggest that Local Enterprise Partnerships should continue to be considered as relevant stakeholders, and that your engagement with us and our partners could usefully be directed via the emerging sub-national transport body, “Transport for the</p>	<p>No comment made</p>

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
		<p>South East”.</p> <p>Proposal 71 refers to the development of a “<i>new gateway station at Old Oak Common</i>” which will be served by the Great Western Mainline, Elizabeth Line, HS2 and Overground services. While the main impact of this will be local to West London, the full potential of this new interchange will have an impact far beyond London. We look forward to the development of “partnership and cooperation with transport authorities and other relevant bodies outside London” in order to realise the full potential of this investment.</p> <p>Proposal 72 refers to working “<i>with stakeholders</i>” in connection with long distance coach services. We suggest that Local Enterprise Partnerships should be considered as relevant stakeholders, and that your engagement with us and our partners could usefully be directed via the emerging sub-national transport body, “Transport for the South East”.</p>	<p>No comment made</p> <p><i>TfL recommends a change to Proposal 72 to add reference both scheduled and tourist coach service and their safe and efficient operation, and a commitment for TfL to work with delivery partners including the coach and tourism industries to develop FORS for coaches.</i></p>
CHAPTER 5 – NEW HOMES AND JOBS (pp 191-254)	18) Policy 19 and proposals 75 to 77 set out the Mayor’s draft plans to ensure that new homes and jobs are delivered in line with the transport principles of ‘good	We support Policy 19 and the associated proposals 75 to 77.	

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
	<p>growth' (see pages 193 to 200). – To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would achieve this?</p>		
<p>CHAPTER 5 – NEW HOMES AND JOBS (pp 191-254)</p>	<p>19) Proposals 78 to 95 set out the Mayor's draft plans to use transport to support and direct good growth, including delivering new rail links, extensions and new stations, improving existing public transport services, providing new river crossings, decking over roads and transport infrastructure and building homes on TfL land (see pages 202 to 246). – To what extent do you agree or disagree that these plans would ensure that transport is used to support and direct good growth?</p>	<p>We welcome Proposal 86 "<i>The Mayor, through TfL and the boroughs, will pilot bus transit networks in outer London Opportunity Areas with the aim of bringing forward development, either ahead of rail investment or to support growth in places without planned rail access.</i>" We suggest that reference be made to extension of such networks outside the GLA boundary where appropriate. We draw attention to the ambition of the Slough MRT system to better connect Heathrow Airport with Slough, which is promoted by Slough BC and supported by Thames Valley Berkshire LEP.</p>	<p>The summary says, "<i>Comments in support of proposals 85 - 87 are noted and welcomed.</i>"</p>
		<p>There is a reference on p203 to "<i>working with willing partners to support development along the strategic corridors</i>" in the Wider South East. We welcome the commitment to partnership working contained in Proposal 94 and look forward to specific proposals for how this might be achieved.</p>	<p>The summary says, "<i>Comments in support of proposals for working with planning authorities within and beyond London in support of good growth are noted and welcomed.</i>"</p>
		<p>We welcome Proposal 95 "<i>The</i></p>	<p>The summary notes the following suggestions,</p>

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
		<p><i>Mayor will promote the improvement of surface links to London’s airports, with airport operators contributing a fair share of the funding required.”</i></p> <p>We suggest that the accompanying text make specific reference to three new routes currently proposed for improving public transport access to Heathrow: Western Rail Link to Heathrow; Southern Rail Access to Heathrow; and Slough MRT (referred to at Proposal 86 above). We believe that investment in these three schemes is justified on the basis of a two-runway airport. We do not regard any or all of them as appropriate mitigation for any expansion proposals.</p>	<p><i>“Heathrow expansion: Opposition of Heathrow expansion should be unconditional · Heathrow and/or Gatwick must be expanded as a priority to support the economy · Heathrow expansion should be conditional on mitigation or air and noise pollution for all affected Londoners both now and in the future · Heathrow expansion should only occur if improvements to public transport links will accommodate background growth as well as demand.</i></p> <p><i>“Rail links to airports: Proposal should reference additional schemes, including Heathrow Southern Access, Heathrow Western Access and Brighton Main Line · Rail links to all airports should be improved</i></p> <p><i>“Improving rail access to Heathrow without airport expansion: Surface access improvement to Heathrow is required regardless of its potential expansion”</i></p> <p>The summary goes on to say, <i>“In his submissions to Government, the Mayor is adamant that expansion cannot be taken forward as proposed, with severe noise and air quality impacts and without the transport investment that could accommodate the additional traffic from expansion alongside background demand.”</i></p>
CHAPTER 5 – NEW HOMES AND JOBS (pp 191-254)	20) Policy 20 and proposal 96 set out the Mayor’s proposed position on the expansion of Heathrow Airport (see pages 248 to 249). – To what extent do you agree or disagree with this position?	Thames Valley Berkshire LEP supports the expansion of the airport subject to appropriate mitigation measures in respect of noise, pollution, surface access and other adverse impacts ⁴ .	See main body of the report for a full discussion of this section.

Heading	Question	TVB LEP Response	Reaction from Mayor of London
		Therefore, we support Policy 20 which allows for the Strategy to support expansion as long as robust safeguards about mitigation of adverse impacts are secured.	
		We regard both the Western Rail Link and the Southern Rail Access schemes to be justified on the basis of a two-runway airport. This position was also adopted by the Davies Commission. We suggest that Proposal 96 is amended to reflect this position.	See main body of the report for a full discussion of this section.
		We suggest that the possible alignment of Southern Rail Access to Heathrow is amended to show other potential alignments which have been reviewed by Network Rail and others.	See main body of the report for a full discussion of this section.

⁴ "The strength of feeling against Heathrow expansion cannot be ignored by the LEP. The current operational environment at Heathrow causes considerable impact in respect of noise, pollution and local congestion. Any proposals for expansion will need to be accompanied by a full range of mitigation measures that acknowledge and respond to these issues." TVB LEP 20 September 2012